

### **REMARKS**

Claims 7, 9-11 and 13-21 are pending. Claims 10, 11 and 21 have been amended. Entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

All pending claims have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Joseph WO 02/085533 A1 (Joseph WO02), in view of Joseph WO 98/32539 (Joseph WO98), Lutz U.S. 2002/0148763 and Spearman U.S. Patent 5,916,435. This rejection has been avoided by the claim amendments.

As noted at page 8 of the Office Action, the cage disclosed in Lutz does not collapse during use and cannot be extended from a collapsed condition. The independent claims of this application have all been amended by adding “during use” at the end of the claims to further clarify that the claimed liquid supply assemblies and combinations have, as structural features, the characteristics recited:

- filter and cage sufficiently flexible to allow them to collapse along the whole length of the filter as the side wall of the container containing them collapses; and
- container, containing the filter and cage, that can be extended from a collapsed condition and filled with the filter and cage in place.

Both of these features exist during use of the claimed articles. Since Lutz’s device does not have the recited features, the cited combination of references fails to make the articles of the amended claims obvious to a person of ordinary skill.

The explanation for the obviousness of the combination of Lutz with Joseph WO02, Joseph WO98 and Spearman at office action page 5 is specifically traversed. It says, in part, that combining Lutz with the other references is obvious because Lutz’s frame 68 is said to decrease the likelihood of crack-related failure. This disregards the fact that Lutz’s device is a metal apparatus used in paper pulp processing; whereas, the claimed articles are all for use with spraying apparatus, and crack related failure in a filter or filter cage has not been shown to be a problem that would be considered by a skilled person in such devices.

With the above claim amendments, the modifications required to the cited references in order to arrive at the amended claims would be too substantial to be obvious to a person of ordinary skill. The arguments made in applicant’s prior response of July 6, 2010 are reiterated. In view of the reasons given and the additional distinctions discussed above, claims 7, 9-11 and

13-21, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and a notification of allowability are respectfully requested. If any questions or issues remain, the resolution of which the Examiner feels would be advanced by a conference with applicant's attorney, she is invited to contact such attorney at the telephone number noted below.

Respectfully submitted,

September 17, 2010

Date

By: /Douglas B. Little/

Douglas B. Little, Reg. No.: 28,439

Telephone No.: 651-733-1501

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833